

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-22 will remain pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added in the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,349,296 ("Broder") in view of United States Patent No. 6,058,410 ("Sharangpani") and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,658,423 ("Pugh"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

#### ***Interview Summary***

Applicant's undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Brent Space participated in a telephonic interview on May 9, 2007. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the above claim amendments, and agreement was reached.

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the feature of removing bits of the supersamples is not supported by the specification. The feature of removing bits of the supersamples is hereby deleted from the claims.

Claims 1-22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the term "most precise bit" in claims 1 and 17 is indefinite. During the interview, the examiner suggested, and Applicant agreed, to replace the term "most precise bit" with the definite term "least significant bit." Additionally, the Office Action alleges that the term "least precise bit" in claims 11, 14, 21 and 22 is indefinite. During the interview, the examiner suggested, and Applicant agreed, to

replace the term "least precise bit" with the definite term "most significant bit." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,349,296 ("Broder") in view of United States Patent No. 6,058,410 ("Sharangpani") and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,658,423 ("Pugh") . Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

**Claims 1-10 and 17-20**

Independent claims 1 and 17 recite that each supersample is compressed to a total number of bits of precision. The number of bits of precision is reduced from the number of bits of precision used in the previous method by generating supersamples that do not include at least one least significant bit of the supersamples used in the previous method.

The Office Action (Pg. 4) states that Broder does not teach "wherein the number of bits of precision is reduced from a number of bits of precision used in the previous method." The Office Action also does not assert that Pugh teaches or suggest this feature. Rather, the Office Action cites Sharangpani (Col. 1, ll. 22-27) as allegedly teaching this feature. Specifically, the "Background" section of Sharangpani (Col. 1, ll. 22-27) states the well-known principle that the results of numeric operations may be rounded. The Office Action asserts that rounding the 64 bit fingerprints of Broder would result in a reduced number of bits of precision (*e.g.*, a number less than 64). Clearly, Applicant does not dispute the well-known mathematical principle that rounding a number will result in a number with less bits than the original number. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that there is no suggestion whatsoever in the Broder reference to alter the number of bits of precision for the generated supersamples. In fact, the Border reference specifically states that 64 bit fingerprints are employed in order to reduce the significance of fingerprint collisions (Broder, Col. 9, l. 15). By contrast, the present application discloses techniques by which the number of bits in the supersample may be reduced *without* increasing the significance of fingerprint collisions. Thus, without the knowledge of the techniques disclosed in the present

application, one would not have been motivated to round (e.g., reduce) the number of bits in the Broder supersample. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that any conclusion that it would have been obvious to combine the supersamples of Broder with the rounding techniques of Sharangpani is based on improper hindsight reasoning. If the Examiner believes that there is some suggestion in the Broder reference to alter the size of the Broder supersamples, then Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point this out.

Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest "wherein the number of bits of precision is reduced from a number of bits of precision used in the previous method, and wherein the number of bits of precision is reduced by generating supersamples that do not include at least one least significant bit of the supersamples used in the previous method" as recited in independent claims 1 and 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 17 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-10 and 18-20 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

Claims 11-16, 21 and 22

Independent claims 11, 14, 21 and 22 recite that each supersample is compressed to 16 bits of precision by recording the 16 most significant bits of the supersample.

For at least the reasons described above, Applicants respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to reduce the 64 bit supersample of Broder to 16 bits using the rounding techniques of Sharangpani.

Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest "compressing each supersample to 16 bits of precision by recording the 16 most significant bits of the supersample" as recited in independent claims 11, 14, 17 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that independent claims 11, 14, 17 and 22 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 307238.01 / MSFT-5031  
**Application No.:** 10/805,805  
**Office Action Dated:** April 10, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Date: June 11, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439